



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

rather than his unsparing anathemas, the more self-satisfied spirit of the Chevalier d'Aceilly, to all those who find themselves cruelly anticipated in the brightest moments of inspiration by some nobody of yesterday. Two hundred years ago, the accomplished chevalier, being reproached with the inroads he had made upon the works of the ancients, replied in this pleasant epigram : and we cordially commend its philosophy to all his successors : —

“ Dis-je quelque chose assez-belle ?  
L'antiquité tout en cervelle  
Pretend l'avoir dite avant moi !  
C'est une plaisante donzelle !  
Que ne-venait elle apres moi ;  
J'aurais dit la chose avant elle ! ”

---

ART. IV. — *History of Liberty.* Part II. *The Early Christians.* By SAMUEL ELIOT. Boston : Little, Brown, & Co. 1853. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. xxii., 413 ; xxiv., 431.

THE metaphors that enter so constantly into colloquial intercourse as to be shunned for their triteness by fastidious rhetoricians, are always founded on close and obvious analogies. This is eminently the case with terms derived from the pictorial art, as applied to history. All history is painting. Lowest in the scale of art and in the capacity of instruction we must place the mere annals of a state or of the race, whether in the dry details of the avowed annalist, or in the smoother paragraphs of the historian who plumes himself on entire freedom from passion and prepossession. Such a narrative is like the painting on a Chinese teacup, in which we can trace distinct outlines of the several objects, but can form no conceptions of their relative magnitudes and distances. As the features of a landscape group themselves on the canvas with some semblance to reality only when a single perspective focus is assumed, so can verisimilitude be given to the historian's narrative only when he has a fixed point of view, a definite theory of national development or decline, of

human progress, of political ethics. We need, to be sure, that the historian be an honest man. He must not suppress or distort undoubted facts. But if he arranges personages and events as they actually present themselves to his mind with relation to his own theory, we then get at least one possible perspective view of the period which the narrative covers; and if our theory differs from his, we may assume our own point of view, and rearrange the perspective with reference to it. Still better can this be effected by the comparison of authors, who have gone over the same ground with similar fidelity, but with widely varying social or political predilections. Thus no one view of Niagara can give an approximate representation of the cataract and its surrounding scenery; but in turning over a series of sketches taken from different points, we have been able to renew in a good measure the impressions made upon the spot. In like manner, Hume, or Lingard, or Macaulay may group the incidents of English history as we would not have them rest in our minds; but the perusal of the various histories of England by Romanists and Protestants, Whigs, Tories, and republicans, would enable us to combine their several representations into a picture of our own.

Gibbon's scepticism as to revealed religion determined the title and the scope of his great work. The material civilization which reached its culminating point in the Augustan age, constituted to his eye the most glorious phasis of human history; and Christianity was one of the destructive forces (the precursor and ally of the Northern barbarians) to which the peerless city, the invincible nation, the world-embracing empire, succumbed in dishonor and desolation. He therefore could only write a "Decline and Fall." Volney's *Ruins* — a threnody worthy a nobler aim — had a similar origin in a mind incapable of appreciating those elements of spiritual growth which germinate beneath shattered thrones and devastated kingdoms.

Mr. Eliot's Second Part of the History of Liberty is, to a considerable degree, parallel as to its subject-matter with Gibbon's great work; but it presents the converse of his diorama, lights for his shadows, shadows for his lights. It is a

Rise and Progress bearing even pace with the Decline and Fall. The first part, entitled "The Liberty of Rome,"\* was an historical sketch of the so-called liberty of the ancient world. The thesis maintained in the earlier and the more recent work conjointly is, in brief, as follows. Ancient liberty was the liberty of communities and nations, as represented by kings, magistrates, aristocracies, or by the governing classes, in whatever form. It had no reference to individuals. It recognized no rights as appertaining to man by virtue of his simple humanity. It utterly excluded the conquered, the captives of war, the enslaved, from the pale of its privileges. The *demos* and the *plebs* shared its immunities only so far as their numerical array and physical force rendered it necessary to propitiate them; and for the most part obtained and kept whatever franchises they had by threats or violence, and generally by a series of contests, in which they were ultimately the losing party because they were unsustained by the consciousness of right, and regarded as mere plunder what was theirs by the law of God and nature. The liberty of the individual had its birth with that of the Founder of Christianity. Its charter is the revelation of God's paternity and human brotherhood. Its unlimited scope is determined by the lowly condition, surroundings, and fortunes of Him who was higher than the highest. Its dynamic force is "the power of the world to come," with its retributive sanctions. A sense of inalienable rights on the part of the less privileged, and a recognition of their rights by those invested with political or social superiority, are inseparable elements of Christian consciousness. The whole fabric of ancient civilization was opposed to these ideas, and was so constructed as to render their incorporation with it impossible. Hence the necessity of its destruction to give them room to grow. The institutions of Paganism received their sentence of death in the song of the herald angels. But, with the strength of centuries in their veins, they died hard, and the mighty agony of their death-throes was attested by the long series of persecutions and the blood of unnumbered martyrs. Moreover, in their

---

\* Reviewed in N. A. Review, January, 1850.

dissolution there was a new fulfilment of the divine word to the first tempter concerning the seed of the woman, — "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." While Christianity aimed a fatal blow at Paganism, she came not from the conflict unscathed. Falsities and corruptions early marred her integrity and defaced her purity. Her conquered enemy left memorials of the struggle in deep and chronic wound-marks. When nominally supreme, she had lost much of her queenly strength and beauty. Her entire recovery is written, not yet in the records of the past, but in the divine year-book of prophecy. But the era of her undoubted convalescence closes the canon of ancient, and opens that of modern history; and at this point Mr. Eliot's labor is suspended, not, we trust, concluded.

The conception that underlies the work before us is one of unsurpassed grandeur. The history of these primitive ages has the majestic form and the rhythmical march of the loftiest of Christian epics. The idea, so far as we know, is original; but it ought not to have been so. We recognize it in our chronology; we reiterate it in the date of every letter. If Christ is not the central personage in social and political history, no less than in the Church of his professed disciples, it is absurd to date from his birth, and to ignore the preceding four thousand years from Adam downward. As the *Anno Mundi* starts from the finishing epoch of the material creation, so does the *Anno Domini* from that of the human *cosmos*, — from the endowment of man with all that makes him a whole and perfect man, — with the spiritual, immortal freedom of the second Adam to supplement the physical perfectness and lordship of the first. Here, then, we have the true and only true focus for historical perspective. Ante-Christian history records the preparations and foreshinings of the advent of the world's Emancipator; post-Christian history, the hinderances and developments of "the liberty wherewith he has made us free."

As to the execution of this work, we must first of all speak with unqualified commendation of the author's accuracy. It would be difficult to point to a single instance of the suppression or unwarranted coloring of a fact. Events are never forced into harmony with the theory, or yoked into the traces

of epic unity, when they are in fact divergent and exceptional. In cases of conflicting testimony, an equal hearing is given to all the witnesses, and equal justice is done to opposite historical readings. First-hand authorities are always quoted, and the crowded references in the foot-notes indicate an affluence of resource and a thoroughness of investigation, which would lead us, did we not know that Mr. Eliot is a young man, to antedate his place on the Triennial Catalogue by a full score of years. Prodigies of youthful genius have been so common, that they are no longer prodigies. But, in the whole range of our reading, we know not another instance in which so early an age has yielded so rich results of patient study and profound scholarship.

We would also express our grateful sense of the elevated tone of sentiment that pervades these volumes. The keen spiritual discernment, the active conscience, the judicial intuition as to right and wrong, leave their tokens on every page. The author is not ashamed to write always as a Christian; and the moral code of the New Testament is his unvarying standard of appeal and of judgment. At the same time, there is no cant, no obtrusive moralizing, no show-language of devotion or religious feeling. Nor is the Christianity of the work that of a sect or a clique, nor yet that grovelling type which eludes sectarianism by being tame, neutral, and omnifaced; but that broad, catholic Christianity, which is of no party, because it transcends party limitations, and assumes that place close to its Founder's heart where differences are blended and contrarieties harmonized.

In an artistical point of view, Mr. Eliot offers himself to criticism under a disadvantage resulting from what we would on no account have had otherwise,—the title of his work. Had he professed to write merely a general history of the earliest Christian centuries, fidelity and explicitness in narration would have amply redeemed his promise. But if the avowed purpose be to indite the history of a sentiment or a principle, there should be a careful adjustment of details with reference to that purpose. Relevant events or personages should be made more or less prominent, as they are more or less directly connected with the development of the

leading idea, and their relation to it should be kept constantly before the reader's mind ; while incidents and actors that have no direct bearing upon it should find their place in notes, appendices, or supplementary chapters. Now Mr. Eliot's chief defect is in the arrangement of his materials. His notes contain little except references and quotations ; nor has he adopted any of the devices to which historians are wont to have resort, for the stowage of such facts or discussions as might impede the easy flow of the narrative. At the same time, his thoroughness and honesty will not suffer him to omit aught that can merit a place in a veracious chronicle of the times. The story is, therefore, somewhat lumbered in the body of the work, by matter that does not essentially belong to "the history of liberty." At the same time, the relevancy of the persons and transactions the most intimately connected with the growth of liberty is not always clearly pointed out, but is often left for the reader's implication. In fine, while the materials for the work were collected with the most patient care and strenuous industry, less time was probably bestowed in their arrangement than the author owed to his subject or to his own permanent reputation.

We are inclined to find a similar fault with Mr. Eliot's style, though in this regard the Second Part exhibits a manifest improvement upon the First. In point of dignity and elegance, there remains nothing to be desired or regretted. But there is a degree of diffuseness, which sometimes mars the perspicuity of the narrative. There is a frequent lack of directness and emphasis. There are few *staccato* passages. There is an evenness of style, that sometimes grows wearisome. The level is high table-land, and the author never sinks below it ; but he seldom rises above it. There is a lack of the picturesque element, which indeed in excess converts history into fiction, but within proper limits aids the reader's imagination in painting the shapes and features of unfamiliar times upon the retina of the inward eye.

But we have exhausted our slender budget of fault-finding ; nor would we have opened it, did we not hope soon to meet our author again on the same honorable career, and to greet his Part Third with a welcome all the heartier for criticism, which we cannot doubt will be as kindly received as offered.

In turning over these volumes for such extracts as would bear to be divorced from their context, we have lighted upon the following tribute to the noble series of Christian mothers, to whose energetic virtue and fervent piety the Church was indebted for some of her brightest ornaments : —

“A new generation appears. Its Emperors are of a different house from that of Constantine. Its Christian leaders are of a different stamp from that of Hilary and Valens, of Arius and Athanasius. New movements begin.

“It was to a few Christian mothers that these movements owed their greatest leaders. Thirty-two years before the accession of Julian, a boy was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, of a noble lady named Emmelia. Under her eye and that of her husband's mother, Macrina, Basil grew up until he reached the age at which a youth is wont to seek the instructions of men. Gregory, known by his later surname of the Nazianzen, was of the same age with Basil, like whom he had been reared by a mother's care. Her name was Nonna; and her son, dedicated before his birth to the Divine service, was educated from his childhood as an offering to God. The brother to whom Gregory wrote the letter lately cited was Cæsarius, a physician at first of Constantius, and afterwards of Julian. The thought of the mother, whose grief Gregory made the chief argument of his appeal, was sufficient to detach Cæsarius from the court. Basil likewise had a brother Gregory, subsequently called the Nyssen. To the women who nurtured them, these children owed their noblest principles when they became leaders of the leading party in the Empire.

“Another mother, the widow of a Gothic Præfect, was watching over her son Ambrose at Rome. Rather than part with him, when the time arrived for seeking other teachers than herself, she accompanied him in his search. From his earlier studies, Ambrose passed to legal pursuits, whence he rose to high distinctions in the Italian provinces. No other Christian influences appear to have been exerted upon his youth and early manhood but those of his mother and his sister. Their piety seems to have prepared him for the foremost place amongst the prelates of his age.

“Eusebius Hieronymus, whom we call Jerome, was of about the same age as Ambrose, both being some ten years younger than Basil and the Gregories. Jerome was born on the borders of Pannonia. ‘From the very cradle,’ he says, ‘I was nourished with Catholic milk.’ He speaks of his mother, but more particularly of his grandmother, as the teacher of his infancy. ‘From her arms,’ he says, ‘they had to take me by force when they sent me away to a master.’



“Younger than all these was Joannes, to whom the epithet of Chrysostomus, that is, the Golden-mouthed, was applied in after years. To his mother, Anthusa, the widow of an imperial general, Chrysostom owed the tenderest care, and to her he returned the sincerest affection. But as he grew up at Antioch, the passion for seclusion, to which many of his contemporaries yielded, seized upon him, the more strongly because his nearest friend had determined upon withdrawing from the world. Thus moved, Chrysostom resolved to resign the affections of home for the penances of a hermitage, where his best aspirations, as he thought, could have their only opportunity of being realized. Most Heathen mothers, prepared to see their children leading troubled, if not polluted lives, would have rejoiced to see their sons depart beyond the reach of oppressions and corruptions. But it was not so with Anthusa. The Christian parent believed her son capable of higher virtues as well as held to truer services than those of seclusion. Taking Chrysostom, as he relates, by the hand, she led him into her chamber, where she broke into tears, and into words more moving, as he confesses, than any tears. ‘I was not long allowed,’ she said, ‘to enjoy your father’s excellence; it did not so please God. His death, happening soon after your birth, too soon made you an orphan and me a widow.’ She spoke of her trials; of the pains that she had taken to preserve the property and to provide for the education of her boy, on whose account she had refused all suitors to her hand. ‘And yet,’ she continued, ‘I do not wish you to think that I am repeating these things with any intention of reproaching you. I but ask in return for what I have endured, that you would not now leave me in a second widowhood, or renew a sorrow that has at last become assuaged. Wait, at least, until I am dead; and that will not be long.’ The supplication prevailed; and Chrysostom remained with his mother to discharge the duty which her entreaties had exalted above the obligation of his proposed solitude. We shall read hereafter of the dignity and the usefulness to which Chrysostom attained in consequence of his filial obedience.

“Augustine, born some years after Chrysostom, in Numidia, has left a description of the anxious love with which his mother Monica was at this time guiding his infancy. ‘As a boy,’ he writes, ‘I had already heard of an eternal life. . . . Even from the womb of my mother, whose hopes were placed in God, I was sealed with the cross. . . . I believed, as my mother did, and as our whole household did, excepting my father. He, however, could not subdue the influence which my mother’s devotion exerted over me, nor could he prevail on me to delay believing, until he himself believed. It was my mother’s labor that Thou, my God, shouldest be my father rather than my mortal

parent.' To resist a husband, in order that a son might be preserved, was not then frequent in human experiences.

"To such mothers as Monica must be ascribed, in a great measure, what we have called the counterpoises against the imperial oppression. That the scale should turn in favor of liberty, required a fresh spirit springing from fresh sources. Who could open these? Was it the Christian leader, leaning upon the power of the sovereign? Was it his follower, accustomed to a dependence of his own as well as to that of the leader? It was apart from men, apart from their councils, as from their tribunals, that the love of Christian freedom needed to be renewed. The mother, watching over the slumbers and over the pursuits of her son, was the prophet of better times to come. Such times might not arrive, not, at least, during the life of those who were thus prepared. But the work of the Christian mother was not the less true, not, in the real sense, less effectual." — Vol. II. pp. 129 – 133.

In taking our leave for the present of Mr. Eliot, we crave indulgence for a brief space on the fruitful subject which he has so happily illustrated. We are no doubt liable to be misled by the ostensibly republican governments of Athens and Rome in their palmy days, and by stereotyped phrases that designate Greece as the cradle of liberty. But, in sober fact, the term *republic*, as applied to the states of classical antiquity, is but the negative of *monarchy* or a euphemism for *oligarchy*. In Athens the slaves outnumbered the free citizens, sometimes in the proportion of twenty to one, and single Roman citizens could count their bondmen by the thousand, or even the ten thousand. These slaves were either insolvent debtors, captives of war, or prizes of conquest, — often the equals or superiors of their masters in culture and refinement, yet utterly divested of legal rights, not even law-protected chattels, but no less subject to arbitrary and irresponsible control than dogs and cattle. While we have no plea to offer for negro slavery, we must maintain in this connection that it bears no parallel with the corresponding institution of the ancients; for the slave is now legally recognized as in certain aspects not a chattel, but a man, with rights and remedies which the law undertakes to guarantee and enforce.

But not the slaves alone, the nominally free poor were unprotected and unprivileged under the ancient republics, —

subjects, not co-sovereigns. In Athens, the citizens of the fourth or poorest class were ineligible to office, and legally incapacitated for bearing any part in the public deliberations. In Rome the plebeian *centuries* were so constituted as to assign to an individual vote less than a tithe of the influence attached to a patrician suffrage, and even this shadow of an elective or governing franchise was vouchsafed to the lower centuries only when a division among the upper made their presence in the *comitia* necessary. The whole history of Rome, from the expulsion of the Tarquins to the elevation of the Cæsars, is that of constant hostility between the patricians and the populace. The problem, in perpetual, though vacillating process of solution, was the *minimum* of rights and privileges which could be conceded to the plebeians consistently with their submission in peace and serviceableness in war. The Agrarian laws, which bore so infamous a name among patrician orators and historians, were no meditated aggression upon the rights of individuals, but simply repeated attempts to multiply the ranks of independent proprietors by dividing among the *plebs* lands which were the property of the state; and Spurius Cassius and the Gracchi incurred death and ignominy solely as the champions of the oppressed and down-trodden against the pride of caste which despised them, and the public policy which sought to perpetuate their degradation. In later times, indeed, the mere name of a Roman citizen, though borne by a pauper or a vagabond, conferred valuable rights and immunities; but not until the multitude of conquered provinces created a larger *plebs*, and elevated the Romans and their affiliated fellow-citizens into a nation of kings. And when that name had become a talisman of defence and honor, the mass of the people in subject states were not only disfranchised, but liable without remedy to whatever mode of extortion, oppression, or wanton cruelty could glut the avarice, gratify the caprice, or satiate the vindictive passions of proconsuls and proprætors.

As for Grecian liberty in gross, it was the liberty of the several states, not of their subjects. It was freedom as regarded Persian or Macedonian aggression, not with reference to domestic tyranny or aristocratic usurpation.

“The *tyrant* of the Chersonese  
Was freedom's best and bravest friend.”

Popular rights had absolutely no defenders. Sparta could vindicate the liberties of Greece by her brave three hundred at Thermopylæ; but her Helots at home had no doubt felt the edge of those selfsame swords in wanton slaughter or in legalized massacre.

But there was one state of antiquity in which we may trace the germs of personal liberty. In Judæa, none were disfranchised. The impoverished, the indebted classes, hired laborers, paupers, slaves, fugitives from bondage, all had rights and immunities which they could legally claim. Offices towards them, that entered not into the charity of any other nation upon earth, were enjoined as matters of legal obligation in the Mosaic code, which precluded pauperism, superseded mendicancy, and established a high average standard of comfort, intelligence, and self-respect. This state of things had not ceased to exist at the Christian era; for, notwithstanding the national degeneracy and corruption, the law of Moses was still the civil constitution and the social directory.

To verify this statement, we might compare the Roman plebeian under Tiberius with the Galilean fisherman of the same age. The plebeian was squalid, ignorant, and generally vicious. His scanty livelihood was eked out by largesses bestowed to obtain his shouts, his services in crimes of stealth or violence, or his physical force in civil commotions and brawls. His domestic relations were vague and brutish; his amusements such as fed the coarsest tastes and the vilest passions. The Galilean fisherman, on the other hand, was a free and an enlightened man. His home was decent and well-ordered. His family enjoyed his protection, and reciprocated his kindness. He was imbued in that noble Hebrew literature, to suppose which independent of Divine inspiration implies a greater miracle than any of which it bears the record. He could sing the psalms of David; and dipped his oar to the rhythm of the loftiest strains that ever flowed from human lip or pen. His curiosity was awake, his mind alert and active. When he drew his boat on shore, and rested with his

companions under its shelter, his talk was of the words of the seers, and the hope of the Great Deliverer. When the eremite John preached by the Jordan, when the Divine Teacher gathered his congregation on the mountain, he left his nets by the sea-side, and plodded many a weary mile to listen. Three times in the year he made his pilgrimage to the metropolis, and joined in the august rites that commemorated the early fortunes of his nation, and kept alive in all minds the great facts of its religious history. The New Testament makes us acquainted with many of these poor men, takes us into their villages and homes, leads us along the shores of their beautiful lake, and shows us how well fitted they were, in mental activity, intelligence, and probity, to welcome the words of Him who spake as never man spake. In no other quarter of the world, had he appeared, could it have been said that "the common people heard him gladly." Nowhere else would there have been common ideas and terms, that could have brought him without a perpetual miracle into so intimate a relation with the popular mind, and won him disciples, capable of becoming teachers of his religion, from among obscure villagers and peasants. Accordingly, Christianity, when first promulgated in Pagan countries, gathered its adherents chiefly from the middle walks of life, and worked its way only by slow degrees, and with many corruptions, down to the lower strata of society, among which in Judea it had found so prompt and genial a reception.

But Judaism lacked breadth and universality. It was the charter of Hebrew, not of human liberty. A heavy ritual yoke was the price of its civil franchise. Through the low and narrow gate of proselytism alone could the Gentile enter upon its immunities. It was reserved for Christianity to attach immeasurable worth and sacredness to every human soul, as the offspring of God and the heir of immortality. These fundamental ideas of the Christian revelation, intensified by the humanity and the redeeming sacrifice of its Author, are the twin pillars of individual freedom. They involve inalienable rights, and reciprocal obligations which have those rights for their measure. These rights were recognized, these obligations owned, from the earliest infancy of the Church, in

munificent provision for the poor, in the free sacrifice of superfluous wealth by the disciples, in the institution of an office expressly designed for the relief of want, and in the blending of distant and stranger communities into a commonwealth of mutual charity and almsgiving, the saints of Macedonia and Achaia sending their liberal contributions to the necessities of the impoverished disciples at Jerusalem. The slave, too, became "the Lord's freeman." The fugitive Onesimus is commended to his former master, "not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved." With the progress of Christianity, the contrasts of social life were everywhere mitigated, and filaments of mutual respect and fellow-feeling united those who had previously sustained only the relation of the preying and the preyed upon. It was the first Christian Emperor that first extended over the slaves of the Roman empire the protection of the law; and it was from the Roman pontificate, during the rapid culmination of its power, that the decree of universal emancipation went forth.

We must indeed confess that Christianity is still far from having accomplished her appointed mission of human enfranchisement. Yet we may trace a broad distinction between the wrongs inflicted and endured in Christendom, and those that are done and borne on Pagan and Mahometan soil. On the latter, there is avowed and irresponsible despotism. Property, liberty, and life are at the mercy of royalty or its minions, without the pretence of right or the mockery of legal sanction. No self-justification, no alleged grounds of public safety or policy, no forms of legal inquiry and adjudication, are necessary to legitimate the foulest acts of extortion or personal outrage; but it is crime enough to be regarded with an unfriendly eye by one in place and power. Under the most despotic governments of Christendom, on the other hand, and for its most arbitrary institutions, there are legal forms and measures. There is not a human being in any nominally Christian country, be he king, noble, peasant, serf, or slave, who purports to be either above the control, or beneath the protection, of the law. Wrong must be normally wrought, under legitimate pretences. Oppression has its limits, and the oppressor beyond those limits is penally account-

able. To be sure, this is less rigidly true in practice than in theory, for the serf or the slave may be too remote from the centre of power and the seat of justice to register his grievance and claim redress; yet on the statute-book, in the intent, or at least the profession, of the supreme authority, he has rights, few though they may be, which cannot be invaded with impunity. This contrast, which, did our limits permit, we should be glad to trace, even between the mildest and freest forms of non-Christian, and the harshest and most arbitrary of (so-called) Christian governments, authorizes us, in accordance with the writer whose admirable work has elicited this paper, to maintain the identity of the history of personal liberty with that of Christianity.

---

ART. V.—*Explanations and Sailing Directions, to accompany the Wind and Current Charts, approved by Commodore Charles Morris, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography, and published by Authority of Hon. J. P. Kennedy, Secretary of the Navy.* By M. F. MAURY, LL.D., Lieutenant U. S. N., Superintendent of the National Observatory. Fifth Edition, enlarged and improved. Washington: C. Alexander. 1853.

ONE of the latest of the new sciences which are the offspring of modern observation, is meteorology. The thick quarto before us is an account of efforts set on foot to ascertain, for public and private benefit, for the guidance and safety of national ships and of merchantmen, the laws of the winds, tides, and storms. Governments as well as individuals have become interested in the matter, although as yet no uniform plan in respect to the instruments and modes of investigation appears to have been established. But, in the outward philosophy of the material world, no point surely can be of more serious and happy concern, than to understand how the wild and, as we call them, lawless elements of nature are themselves brought into perfect obedience to unvarying rules.